arXiv:1606.05252v3 [math.AG] 27 Nov 2016

DIVISION BY 2 ON HYPERELLIPTIC CURVES AND JACOBIANS

YURI G. ZARHIN

1. Introduction

Let K be an algebraically closed field of characteristic different from 2. If n and i are positive integers and $\mathbf{r} = \{r_1, \ldots, r_n\}$ is a sequence of n elements $r_i \in K$ then we write

$$\mathbf{s}_i(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{s}_i(r_1, \ldots, r_n) \in K$$

for the ith basic symmetric function in $r_1, \ldots, r_n$. If we put $r_{n+1} = 0$ then $\mathbf{s}_i(r_1, \ldots, r_n) = \mathbf{s}_i(r_1, \ldots, r_n, r_{n+1})$.

Let $g \ge 1$ be an integer. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the smooth projective model of the smooth affine plane K-curve

$$y^2 = f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (x - \alpha_i)$$

where $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{2g+1}$ are *distinct* elements of K. It is well known that $\mathcal{C}$ is a genus g hyperelliptic curve over K with precisely one *infinite* point, which we denote by ∞. In other words,

$$\mathcal{C}(K) = \{(a, b) \in K^2 \mid b^2 = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (a - \alpha_i)\} \bigsqcup \{\infty\}.$$

Clearly, x and y are nonconstant rational functions on $\mathcal{C}$, whose only pole is ∞. More precisely, the polar divisor of x is $2(\infty)$ and the polar divisor of y is $(2g+1)(\infty)$. The zero divisor of y is $\sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} (\mathfrak{W}_i)$ where

$$\mathfrak{W}_i = (\alpha_i, 0) \in \mathcal{C}(K) \ \forall i = 1, \ldots, 2g+1.$$

We write ι for the hyperelliptic involution

$$\iota : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}, (x, y) \mapsto (x, -y), \ \infty \mapsto \infty.$$

The set of fixed points of ι consists of ∞ and all $\mathfrak{W}_i$. It is well known that for each $P \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ the divisor $(P) + \iota(P) - 2(\infty)$ is principal. More precisely, if $P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ then $(P) + \iota(P) - 2(\infty)$ is the divisor of the rational function $x - a$ on C. If D is a divisor on $\mathcal{C}$ then we write $\mathrm{supp}(D)$ for its *support*, which is a finite subset of $\mathcal{C}(K)$.

We write J for the jacobian of $\mathcal{C}$, which is a g-dimensional abelian variety over K. If D is a degree zero divisor on $\mathcal{C}$ then we write $\mathrm{cl}(D)$ for its linear equivalence class, which is viewed as an element of $J(K)$. We will identify $\mathcal{C}$ with its image in J with respect to the canonical regular map $\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow J$ under which ∞ goes to the zero of group law on J. In other words, a point $P \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ is identified with $\mathrm{cl}((P) - (\infty)) \in J(K)$. Then the action of ι on $\mathcal{C}(K) \subset J(K)$ coincides with

multiplication by -1 on $J(K)$. In particular, the list of points of order 2 on $\mathcal{C}$ consists of all $\mathfrak{W}_i$.

Recall [21, Sect. 13.2, p. 411] that if D is an effective divisor of (nonnegative) degree m, whose support does *not* contain ∞, then the degree zero divisor $D-m(\infty)$ is called *semi-reduced* if it enjoys the following properties.

- If $\mathfrak{W}_i$ lies in $\mathrm{supp}(D)$ then it appears in D with multiplicity 1.
- If a a point Q of $\mathcal{C}(K)$ lies in $\mathrm{supp}(D)$ and does not coincide with any of $\mathfrak{W}_i$ then $\iota(P)$ does *not* lie in $\mathrm{supp}(D)$.

If, in addition, $m \le g$ then $D - m(\infty)$ is called *reduced*.

It is known ([9, Ch. 3a], [21, Sect. 13.2, Prop. 3.6 on p. 413]) that for each $\mathfrak{a} \in J(K)$ there exist *exactly one* nonnegative m and (effective) degree m divisor D such that the degree zero divisor $D - m(\infty)$ is *reduced* and $\mathrm{cl}(D - m(\infty)) = \mathfrak{a}$. (E.g.,, the zero divisor with $m = 0$ corresponds to $\mathfrak{a} = 0$.) If

$$m \ge 1,\ D = \sum_{j=1}^{m} (Q_j) \text{ where } Q_j = (b_j, c_j) \in \mathcal{C}(K)\ \forall\ j = 1, \dots, m$$

(here Q_j do *not* have to be distinct) then the corresponding

$$\mathfrak{a} = \mathrm{cl}(D - m(\infty)) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} Q_j \in J(K).$$

The *Mumford's representation* ([9, Sect. 3.12], [21, Sect. 13.2, pp. 411–415, especially, Prop. 13.4, Th. 13.5 and Th. 13.7] of $\mathfrak{a} \in J(K)$ is is the pair $(U(x), V(x))$ of polynomials $U(x), V(x) \in K[x]$ such that

$$U(x) = \prod_{j=1}^{r} (x - a_j)$$

is a degree r monic polynomial while $V(x)$ has degree $m < \deg(U)$, the polynomial $V(x)^2 - f(x)$ is divisible by $U(x)$, and $D - m(\infty)$ coincides with the *gcd* (i.e., with the minimum) of the divisors of rational functions $U(x)$ and $y - V(x)$ on $\mathcal{C}$. This implies that each Q_j is a zero of $y - V(x)$, i.e.,

$$b_j = V(a_j),\ Q_j = (a_j, V(a_j)) \in \mathcal{C}(K)\ \forall\ j = 1, \dots m.$$

Such a pair always exists, it is unique, and (as we've just seen) uniquely determines not only $\mathfrak{a}$ but also divisors D and $D - m(\infty)$. (The case $\alpha = 0$ corresponds to $m = 0, D = 0$ and the pair $(U(x) = 1, V(x) = 0)$.)

Conversely, if $U(x)$ is a monic polynomial of degree $m \le g$ and $V(x)$ a polynomial such that $\deg(V) < \deg(U)$ and $V(x)^2 - f(x)$ is divisible by $U(x)$ then there exists exactly one $\mathfrak{a} = \mathrm{cl}(D - m(\infty))$ where $D - m(\infty)$ is a reduced divisor such that $(U(x), V(x)$ is the Mumford's representation of $\mathrm{cl}(D - m(\infty))$.

Let $P = (a, b)$ be a K-point on $\mathcal{C}$, i.e.,

$$a, b \in K,\ b^2 = f(a) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} (a - \alpha_i).$$

The aim of this note is to divide explicitly P by 2 in $J(K)$, i.e., to give explicit formulas for the *Mumford's representation* of *all* 2^{2g} divisor classes $\mathrm{cl}(D - g(\infty))$ such that $2D + \iota(P)$ is linearly equivalent to $(2g + 1)\infty$, i.e.,

$$2\mathrm{cl}(D - g(\infty)) = P \in \mathcal{C}(K) \subset J(K).$$

(It turns out that each such D has degree g and its support does not contain any of $\mathfrak{W}_i$.)

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we obtain auxiliary results about divisors on hyperelliptic curves. In particular, we prove (Theorem 2.4) that if $g > 1$ then the only point of $\mathcal{C}(K)$ that is divisible by two in $\mathcal{C}(K)$ (rather than in $J(K)$) is ∞ (of course, if $g > 1$). We also prove that $\mathcal{C}(K)$ does *not* contain points of order n if $2 < n \le 2g$. In Section 3 we describe explicitly for a given $P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ the Mumford's representation of 2^{2g} divisor classes $\mathrm{cl}(D - g(\infty))$ such that D is an effective degree g reduced divisor on $\mathcal{C}$ and

$$2\mathrm{cl}(D - g(\infty)) = P \in \mathcal{C}(K) \subset J(K).$$

The description is given in terms of square roots $\sqrt{a - \alpha_i}$'s ($1 \le i \le 2g+1$), whose product is $-b$. (There are exactly 2^{2g} choices of such square roots.) In Section 4 we discuss the *rationality questions*, i.e., the case when $f(x), \mathcal{C}, J$ and P are defined over a subfield K_0 of K and ask when dividing P by 2 we get a point of $J(K_0)$.

Sections 5 and 6 deal with torsion points on certain naturally arised subvarieties of J containg $\mathcal{C}$. In particular, we discuss the case of a *generic hyperelliptic curve* in characteristic zero, using as a starting point results of B. Poonen - M. Stoll [11] and of J. Yelton [22]. Our approach is based on ideas of J.-P. Serre [17] and F. Bogomolov [4].

This paper is a follow up of [24, 3] where the (more elementary) case of elliptic curves is discussed.

Acknowledgements. I am deeply grateful to Bjorn Poonen for helpful stimulationg discussions. This work was partially supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation (#246625 to Yuri Zarkhin). I've started to write this paper during my stay in May-June 2016 at the Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik (Bonn, Germany), whose hospitality and support are gratefully acknowledged.

2. Divisors on hyperelliptic curves

Lemma 2.1 (Key Lemma)**.** *Let D be an effective divisor on $\mathcal{C}$ of degree $m > 0$ such that $m \le 2g + 1$ and $\mathrm{supp}(D)$ does not contain ∞. Assume that the divisor $D - m(\infty)$ is principal.*

1. *Suppose that m is odd. Then:*
   - (i) *$m = 2g + 1$ and there exists exactly one polynomial $v(x) \in K[x]$ such that the divisor of $y - v(x)$ coincides with $D - (2g+1)(\infty)$. In addition, $\deg(v) \le g$.*
   - (ii) *If $\mathfrak{W}_i$ lies in $\mathrm{supp}(D)$ then it appears in D with multiplicity 1.*
   - (iii) *If b is a nonzero element of K and a K-point $P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ lies in $\mathrm{supp}(D)$ then $\iota(P) = (a, -b)$ does not lie in $\mathrm{supp}(D)$.*
2. *Suppose that $m = 2d$ is even. Then there exists exactly one monic degree d polynomial $u(x) \in K[x]$ such that the divisor of $v(x)$ coincides with $D - m(\infty)$. In particular, every point $Q \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ appears in $D - m(\infty)$ with the same multiplicity as $\iota(Q)$.*

Proof. Leh h be a rational function on $\mathcal{C}$, whose divisor coincides with $D - m(\infty)$. Since ∞ is the only pole of h, the function h is a polynomial in x, y and therefore may be presented as

$$h = s(x)y - v(x), \text{ with } u, v \in K[x].$$

If $s=0$ then h has at ∞ the pole of even order $2\deg(v)$ and therefore $m=2\deg(v)$.

Suppose that $s\ne 0$. Clearly, $s(x)y$ has at ∞ the pole of odd order $2\deg(s)+(2g+1)\ge(2g+1)$. So, the orders of the pole for $s(x)y$ and $v(x)$ are distinct, because they have different parity and therefore the order m of the pole of $h=s(x)y-v(x)$ coincides with $\max(2\deg(s)+(2g+1),2\deg(v))\ge 2g+1$. This implies that $m=2g+1$; in particular, m is even. It follows that m is *even* if and only if $s(x)=0$, i.e., $h=-v(x)$; in addition, $\deg(v)\le(2g+1)/2$, i.e., $\deg(v)\le g$. In order to finish the proof of (2), it suffices to divide $-v(x)$ by its leading coefficient and denote the ratio by $u(x)$. (The uniqueness of monic $u(x)$ is obvious.)

Let us prove (1). Since m is *odd*,

$$m=2\deg(s)+(2g+1)>2\deg(v).$$

Since $m\le 2g+1$, we obtain that $\deg(s)=0$, i.e., s is a nonzero element of K and $2\deg(v)<2g+1$. The latter inequality means that $\deg(v)\le g$. Dividing h by the constant s, we may and will assume that $s=1$ and therefore $h=y-v(x)$ with

$$v(x)\in K[x],\ \deg(v)\le g.$$

This proves (i). (The uniqueness of v is obvious.) The assertion (ii) is contained in Proposition 13.2(b) on pp. 409-10 of [21]. In order to prove (iii), we just follow arguments on p. 410 of [21] (where it is actually proven). Notice that our $P=(a,b)$ is a zero of $y-v(x)$, i.e. $b-v(a)=0$. Since, $b\ne 0$, $v(a)=b\ne 0$ and $y-v(x)$ takes on at $\iota(P)=(a,-b)$ the value $-b-v(a)=-2b\ne 0$. This implies that $\iota(P)$ is *not* a zero of $y-v(x)$, i.e., $\iota(P)$ does not lie in $\mathrm{supp}(D)$. □

Remark 2.2. Lemma 2.1(1)(ii,iii) asserts that if m is odd the divisor $D-m(\infty)$ is *semi-reduced*. See [21, the penultimate paragraph on p. 411].

Corollary 2.3. *Let $P=(a,b)$ be a K-point on $\mathcal{C}$ and D an effective divisor on $\mathcal{C}$ such that $m=\deg(D)\le g$ and $\mathrm{supp}(D)$ does not contain ∞. Suppose that the degree zero divisor $2D+\iota(P)-(2m+1)(\infty)$ is principal. Then:*

(i) *$m=g$ and there exists a polynomial $v_D(x)\in K[x]$ such that $\deg(v)\le g$ and the divisor of $y-v_D(x)$ coincides with $2D+\iota(P)-(2g+1)(\infty)$. In particular, $-b=v(a)$.*

(ii) *If a point Q lies in $\mathrm{supp}(D)$ then $\iota(Q)$ does not lie in $\mathrm{supp}(D)$. In particular,*
   (1) *none of $\mathfrak{W}_i$ lies in $\mathrm{supp}(D)$;*
   (2) *$D-g(\infty)$ is reduced.*

(iii) *The point P does not lie in $\mathrm{supp}(D)$.*

Proof. One has only to apply Lemma 2.1 to the divisor $2D+\iota(P)$ of *odd* degree $2m+1\le 2g+1$ and notice that $\iota(P)=(a,-b)$ is a zero of $y-v(x)$ while $\iota(\mathfrak{W}_i)=\mathfrak{W}_i$ for all $i=1,\dots,2g+1$. □

Let $d\le g$ be a positive integer and $\Theta_d\subset J$ be the image of the regular map

$$\mathcal{C}^d\to J,\ (Q_1,\dots,Q_d)\mapsto\sum_{i=1}^{d}Q_i\subset J.$$

It is well known that Θ_d is a closed d-dimensional subvariety of J that coincides with $\mathcal{C}$ for $d=1$ and with J if $d\ge g$; in addition, $\Theta_d\subset\Theta_{d+1}$ for all d. Clearly, each Θ_d is stable under multiplication by -1 in J. We write Θ for the $(g-1)$-dimensional *theta divisor* Θ_{g-1}.

Theorem 2.4. *Suppose that $g > 1$ and let*

$$\mathcal{C}_{1/2} := 2^{-1}\mathcal{C} \subset J$$

be the preimage of $\mathcal{C}$ with respect to multiplication by 2 in J. Then the intersection of $\mathcal{C}_{1/2}(K)$ and Θ consists of points of order dividing 2 on J. In particular, the intersection of $\mathcal{C}$ and $C_{1/2}$ consists of ∞ and all $\mathfrak{W}_i$'s.

Proof. Suppose that $m \le g-1$ is a positive integer and we have m (not necessarily distinct) points $Q_1, \dots Q_m$ of $\mathcal{C}(K)$ and a point $P \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ such that in $J(K)$

$$2\sum_{j=1}^{m} Q_j = P.$$

We need to prove that $P = \infty$, i.e., it is the zero of group law in J and therefore $\sum_{j=1}^m Q_j$ is an element of order 2 (or 1) in $J(K)$. Suppose that this is not true. Decreasing m if necessary, we may and will assume that none of Q_j is ∞ (but m is still positive and does not exceed $g-1$). Let us consider the effective degree m divisor $D = \sum_{j=1}^m (Q_j)$ on $\mathcal{C}$. The equality in J means that the divisors $2[D - m(\infty)]$ and $(P) - (\infty)$ on $\mathcal{C}$ are linearly equivalent. This means that the divisor $2D + (\iota(P)) - (2m+1)(\infty)$ is *principal*. Now Corollary 2.3 tells us that $m = g$, which is not the case. The obtained contradiction proves that the intersection of $\mathcal{C}_{1/2}$ and Θ consists of points of order 2 and 1.

Since $g > 1$, $\mathcal{C} \subset \Theta$ and therefore the intersection of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{1/2}$ also consists of points of order 2 or 1, i.e., lies in the union of ∞ and all $\mathfrak{W}_i$'s. Conversely, since each $\mathfrak{W}_i$ has order 2 in $J(K)$ and ∞ has order 1, they all lie in $\mathcal{C}_{1/2}$ (and, of course, in $\mathcal{C}$). □

Remark 2.5. It is known [16, Ch. VI, last paragraph of Sect. 11, p. 122] that the curve $\mathcal{C}_{1/2}$ is irreducible. (Its projectiveness and smoothness follow readily from the projectiveness and smoothness of $\mathcal{C}$ and the étaleness of multiplication by 2 in J.) See [7] for an explicit description of equations that cut out $\mathcal{C}_{1/2}$ in a projective space.

Corollary 2.6. *Suppose that $g > 1$. Let n an integer such that $3 \le n \le 2g$. Then $\mathcal{C}(K)$ does not contain a point of order n in $J(K)$. In particular, $\mathcal{C}(K)$ does not contain points of order 3 or 4.*

Proof. Suppose that such a point say, P exists. Clearly, P is neither ∞ nor one of $\mathfrak{W}_i$, i.e., $P \ne \iota(P)$.

Suppose that n is odd. Then we have $n = 2m+1$ with $1 \le m < g$. This implies that $mP \in \Theta$ and

$$2(mP) = 2mP = -P = \iota(P) \in \mathcal{C}(K).$$

It follows from Theorem 2.4 that either $mP = 0$ in $J(K)$ or $(2m)P = 2(mP) = 0$ in $J(K)$. However, the order of P in $J(K)$ is $n = 2m+1 > m \ge 1$ and we get a desired contradiction.

Assume now that n is even. Then we have $n = 2m$ with $1 < m \le g$. Then mP has order 2 in $J(K)$. It follows that

$$mP = -mP = m(-P) = m\ \iota(P).$$

This means that the degree zero divisors $m(P) - m(\infty)$ and $m(\iota(P)) - m(\infty)$ belong to the same linear equivalence class. Since both divisors are *reduced*, they must

coincide (see [21, Ch. 13, Prop. 13.6 on p. 413]). This implies that $P = \iota(P)$, which is not the case and we get a desired contradiction. □

Remark 2.7. If $\mathrm{char}(K) = 0$ and $g > 1$ then the famous theorem of M. Raynaud (conjectured by Yu.I. Manin and D. Mumford) asserts that an arbitrary genus g smooth projective curve over K embedded into its jacobian contains only finitely many torsion points [12]. Using a p-adic approach, B. Poonen [10] developed and implemented an algorithm that finds all complex torsion points on genus 2 hyperelliptic curves $\mathcal{C} : y^2 = f(x)$ such that $f(x)$ has rational coefficients. (See also [11].)

Theorem 2.8. *Suppose that $g > 1$ and let $N > 1$ be positive integer. Suppose that $N \le 2g - 1$ and let us put*

$$d(N) = \left[\frac{2g}{N+1}\right].$$

Let K_0 be a subfield of K such that $f(x) \in K_0[x]$. Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be a K-point on $\Theta_{d(N)}$. Suppose that there is a field automorphism $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(K/K_0)$ such that $\sigma(\mathfrak{a}) = N\mathfrak{a}$ or $-N\mathfrak{a}$. Then $\mathfrak{a}$ has order 1 or 2 in $J(K)$.

Proof. Clearly, $(N+1) \cdot d(N) < 2g + 1$. Let us assume that $2\mathfrak{a} \ne 0$ in $J(K)$. We need to arrive to a contradiction. Then there is a positive integer $r \le d(N)$ and a sequence of points $P_1, \dots, P_r$ of $\mathcal{C}(K) \setminus \infty$ such that $\tilde{D} := \sum_{j=1}^{r}(P_j) - r(\infty)$ is the Mumford's representation of $\mathfrak{a}$ while (say) P_1 does not coincides with any of W_i (here we use the assumption that $2\mathfrak{a} \ne 0$); we may also assume that P_1 has the largest *multiplicity* say, M among $\{P_1, \dots, P_r\}$. (In particular, none of P_j's coincides with $\iota(P_1)$.) Then $\sigma(\tilde{D}) = \sum_{j=1}^{r}(\sigma(P_j)) - r(\infty)$ is the Mumford's representation of $\sigma\mathfrak{a}$. In particular, the multiplicity of each $\sigma(P_j)$ in $\sigma(\tilde{D})$ does *not* exceed M; similarly, the multiplicity of each $\iota\sigma(P_j)$ in $\iota\sigma(\tilde{D})$ does *not* exceed M.

Suppose that $\sigma(\mathfrak{a}) = N\mathfrak{a}$.

$$N\tilde{D} + \iota\sigma(\tilde{D}) = N\left[\sum_{j=1}^{r}(P_j)\right] + \left[\sum_{j=1}^{r}(\iota\sigma(P_j))\right] - r(N+1)(\infty)$$

is a principal divisor on $\mathcal{C}$. Since $m := r(N+1) \le (N+1) \cdot d(N) < 2g + 1$, we are in position to apply Lemma 2.1, which tells us right away that m is *even* and there is a monic polynomial $u(x)$ of degree $m/2$, whose divisor coincides with $N\tilde{D} + \iota\sigma(\tilde{D})$. This implies that a point $Q \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ appears in $N\tilde{D} + \iota\sigma(\tilde{D})$ with the same multiplicity as ιQ. It follows that ιP_1 is (at least) one of $\iota\sigma(P_j)$'s. Clearly, the multiplicity of P_1 in $N\tilde{D} + \iota\sigma(\tilde{D})$ is, at least, NM while the multiplicity of $\iota(P_1)$ is, at most, M. This implies that $NM \le M$. Taking into account that $N > 1$, we obtain the desired contradiction.

If $\sigma(\mathfrak{a}) = -N\mathfrak{a}$ then literally the same arguments applied to to the principal divisor

$$N\tilde{D} + \sigma(\tilde{D}) = N\left[\sum_{j=1}^{r}(P_j)\right] + \left[\sum_{j=1}^{r}(\sigma(P_j))\right] - r(N+1)(\infty)$$

also lead to the contradiction. □

3. Division by 2

Suppose we are given a point

$$P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K) \subset J(K).$$

Since $\dim(J) = g$, there are exactly 2^{2g} points $\mathfrak{a} \in J(K)$ such that

$$P = 2\mathfrak{a} \in J(K).$$

Let us choose such an $\mathfrak{a}$. Then there is exactly one effective divisor

$$D = D(\mathfrak{a}) \tag{1}$$

of positive degree m on $\mathcal{C}$ such that $\mathrm{supp}(D)$ does *not* contain ∞, the divisor $D - m(\infty)$ is reduced, and

$$m \le g,\ \mathrm{cl}(D - m(\infty)) = \mathfrak{a}.$$

It follows that the divisor $2D + (\iota(P)) - (2m+1)(\infty)$ is *principal* and, thanks to Corollary 2.3, $m = g$ and $\mathrm{supp}(D)$ does *not* contains any of $\mathfrak{W}_i$. (In addition, $D - g(\infty)$ is reduced.) Then the degree g effective divisor

$$D = D(\mathfrak{a}) = \sum_{j=1}^{g} (Q_j) \tag{2}$$

with $Q_i = (c_j, d_j) \in \mathcal{C}(K)$. Since none of Q_j coincides with any of $\mathfrak{W}_i$,

$$c_j \ne \alpha_i\ \forall i, j.$$

By Corollary 2.3, there is a polynomial $v_D(x)$ of degree $\le g$ such that the degree zero divisor

$$2D + (\iota(P)) - (2g+1)(\infty)$$

is the divisor of $y - v_D(x)$. Since the points $\iota(P) = (a, -b)$ and all Q_j's are zeros of $y - v_D(x)$,

$$b = -v_D(a),\ d_j = v_D(c_j)\ \forall j = 1, \dots, g.$$

It follows from Proposition 13.2 on pp. 409–410 of [21] that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (x - \alpha_i) - v_D(x)^2 = f(x) - v_D(x)^2 = (x - a) \prod_{j=1}^{g} (x - c_j)^2. \tag{3}$$

In particular, $f(x) - v_D(x)^2$ is divisible by

$$u_D(x) := \prod_{j=1}^{g} (x - c_j). \tag{4}$$

Remark 3.1. Summing up:

$$D = D(\mathfrak{a}) = \sum_{j=1}^{g} (Q_j),\ Q_j = (c_j, v_D(c_j))\ \forall j = 1, \dots, g$$

and the dgree g monic polynomial $u_D(x) = \prod_{j=1}^{g} (x - c_j)$ divides $f(x) - v_D(x)^2$. By Prop. 13.4 on p. 412 of [21], this implies that reduced $D - g(\infty)$ coincides with the gcd of the divisors of $u_D(x)$ and $y - v_D(x)$. Therefore the pair (u_D, v_D) is the Mumford's representation of $\mathfrak{a}$ if

$$\deg(v_D) < g = \deg(u_D).$$

This is not always the case: it may happen that $\deg(v_D) = g = \deg(u_D)$ (see below). However, if we replace $v_D(x)$ by its remainder with respect to the division by $u_D(x)$ then we get the Mumford's representation of $\mathfrak{a}$ (see below).

If in (3) we put $x = \alpha_i$ then we get

$$-v_D(\alpha_i)^2 = (\alpha_i - a)\left(\prod_{j=1}^{g}(\alpha_i - c_j)\right)^2,$$

i.e.,

$$v_D(\alpha_i)^2 = (a - \alpha_i)\left(\prod_{j=1}^{g}(c_j - \alpha_i)\right)^2 \quad \forall\ i = 1, \dots, 2g+1.$$

Since none of $c_j - \alpha_i$ vanishes, we may define

$$r_i = r_{i,D} := \frac{v_D(\alpha_i)}{\prod_{j=1}^{g}(c_j - \alpha_i)} \tag{5}$$

with

$$r_i^2 = a - \alpha_i \ \forall\ i = 1, \dots, 2g+1 \tag{6}$$

and

$$\alpha_i = a - r_i^2,\ c_j - \alpha_i = r_i^2 - a + c_j \ \forall\ i = 1, \dots, 2g+1; j = 1, \dots, g.$$

Clearly, all r_i's are *distinct* elements of K, because their squares are obviously distinct. (By the same token, $r_{j_1} \neq \pm r_{j_2}$ if $j_1 \neq j_2$. Notice that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i = \pm b, \tag{7}$$

because

$$b^2 = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1}(a - \alpha_i) = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i^2.) \tag{8}$$

Now we get

$$r_i = \frac{v_D(a - r_i^2)}{\prod_{j=1}^{g}(r_i^2 - a + c_j)},$$

i.e.,

$$r_i \prod_{j=1}^{g}(r_i^2 - a + c_j) - v_D(a - r_i^2) = 0 \ \forall\ i = 1, \dots 2g+1.$$

This means that the degree $(2g+1)$ *monic* polynomial (recall that $\deg(v_D) \le g$)

$$h_{\mathbf{r}}(t) := t\prod_{j=1}^{g}(t^2 - a + c_j) - v(a - t^2)$$

has $(2g+1)$ *distinct* roots $r_1, \dots, r_{2g+1}$. This means that

$$h_{\mathbf{r}}(t) = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1}(t - r_i).$$

Clearly, $t\prod_{j=1}^{g}(t^2-a+c_i)$ coincides with the *odd part* of $h_{\mathbf{r}}(t)$ while $-v_D(a-t^2)$ coincides with the *even part* of $h_{\mathbf{r}}(t)$. In particular, if we put $t=0$ then we get

$$(-1)^{2g+1}\prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i = -v_D(a) = b,$$

i.e.,

$$\prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i = -b. \tag{9}$$

Let us define

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_D := (r_1, \dots, r_{2g+1}) \in K^{2g+1}.$$

Since

$$\mathbf{s}_i(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{s}_i(r_1, \dots, r_{2g+1})$$

is the ith basic symmetric function in $r_1, \dots, r_{2g+1}$,

$$h_{\mathbf{r}}(t) = t^{2g+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{2g+1}(-1)^i \mathbf{s}_i(\mathbf{r})t^{2g+1-i} = [t^{2g+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{2g}(-1)^i s_i(\mathbf{r})t^{2g+1-i}] + b.$$

Then

$$t\prod_{j=1}^{g}(t^2-a+c_j) = t^{2g+1} + \sum_{j=1}^{g}\mathbf{s}_{2j}(\mathbf{r})t^{2g+1-2j},$$

$$-v_D(a-t^2) = [-\sum_{j=1}^{g}\mathbf{s}_{2j-1}(\mathbf{r})t^{2g-2j+2}] + b.$$

It follows that

$$\prod_{j=1}^{g}(t-a+c_j) = t^g + \sum_{j=1}^{g}\mathbf{s}_{2j-1}(\mathbf{r})t^{g-j},$$

$$v_D(a-t) = \sum_{j=1}^{g}\mathbf{s}_{2j-1}(\mathbf{r})t^{g-j+1} - b.$$

This implies that

$$v_D(t) = \left[\sum_{j=1}^{g}\mathbf{s}_{2j-1}(\mathbf{r})(a-t)^{g-j+1}\right] - b. \tag{10}$$

It is also clear that if we consider the degree g monic polynomial

$$U_{\mathbf{r}}(t) := u_D(t) = \prod_{j=1}^{g}(t-c_j)$$

then

$$U_{\mathbf{r}}(t) = (-1)^g\left[(a-t)^g + \sum_{j=1}^{g}\mathbf{s}_{2j}(\mathbf{r})(a-t)^{g-j}\right]. \tag{11}$$

Recall that $\deg(v_D) \le g$ and notice that the coefficient of $v(x)$ at x^g is $(-1)^g\mathbf{s}_1(\mathbf{r})$. This implies that the polynomial

$$V_{\mathbf{r}}(t) := v_D(t) - (-1)^g\mathbf{s}_1(\mathbf{r})U_{\mathbf{r}}(t) =$$

$$\left[\sum_{j=1}^{g} \mathbf{s}_{2j-1}(\mathbf{r})(a-t)^{g-j+1}\right] - b - \mathbf{s}_1(\mathbf{r})\left[(a-t)^g + \sum_{j=1}^{g} \mathbf{s}_{2j}(\mathbf{r})(a-t)^{g-j}\right] \quad (12)$$

has degree $< g$, i.e.,

$$\deg(V_{\mathbf{r}}) < \deg(U_{\mathbf{r}}) = g.$$

Clearly, $f(x) - V_{\mathbf{r}}(x)^2$ is still divisible by $U_{\mathbf{r}}(x)$, because $u_D(x) = U_{\mathbf{r}}(x)$ divides both $f(x) - v_D(x)^2$ and $v_D(x) - V_{\mathbf{r}}(x)$. On the other hand,

$$d_j = v_D(c_j) = V_{\mathbf{r}}(c_j)\ \forall j = 1, \dots g,$$

because $U_{\mathbf{r}}(x)$ divides $v_D(x) - V_{\mathbf{r}}(x)$ and vanishes at all b_j. Actually, $\{b_1, \dots, b_g\}$ is the list of all roots (with multiplicities) of $U_{\mathbf{r}}(x)$. So,

$$D = D(\mathfrak{a}) = \sum_{j=1}^{g}(Q_j),\ Q_j = (c_j, v_D(c_j)) = (c_j, V_{\mathbf{r}}(c_j))\ \forall j = 1, \dots, g.$$

This implies (again via Prop. 13.4 on p. 412 of [21]) that reduced $D - g(\infty)$ coincides with the gcd of the divisors of $U_{\mathbf{r}}(x)$ and $y - V_{\mathbf{r}}(x)$. It follows that the pair $(U_{\mathbf{r}}(x), V_{\mathbf{r}}(x))$ is the *Mumford's representation* of $\mathrm{cl}(D - g(\infty)) = \mathfrak{a}$. So, the formulas (11) and (12) give us an explicit construction of ($D(\mathfrak{a})$ and) $\mathfrak{a}$ in terms of $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_{2g+1})$ for each of 2^{2g} choices of $\mathfrak{a}$ with $2\mathfrak{a} = P \in J(K)$. On the other hand, in light of (6)-(8), there is exactly the same number 2^{2g} of choices of square roots $\sqrt{a - \alpha_i}$ $(1 \le i \le 2g)$, whose product is $-b$. Combining it with (9), we obtain that for each choice of square roots $\sqrt{a - \alpha_i}$'s with $\prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} \sqrt{a - \alpha_i} = -b$ there is precisely one $\mathfrak{a} \in J(K)$ with $2\mathfrak{a} = P$ such that the corresponding r_i defined by (5) coincides with chosen $\sqrt{a - \alpha_i}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, 2g + 1$, and the Mumford's representation $(U_{\mathbf{r}}(x), V_{\mathbf{r}}(x))$ for this $\mathfrak{a}$ is given by explicit formulas (11)-(12). This gives us the following assertion.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K)$. Then the 2^{2g}-element set*

$$M_{1/2,P} := \{\mathfrak{a} \in J(K) \mid 2\mathfrak{a} = P \in \mathcal{C}(K) \subset J(K)\}$$

can be described as follows. Let $\mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$ be the set of all $(2g+1)$-tuples $\mathfrak{r} = (\mathfrak{r}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{r}_{2g+1})$ of elements of K such that

$$\mathfrak{r}_i^2 = a - \alpha_i\ \forall\ i = 1, \dots, 2g+1;\ \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} \mathfrak{r}_i = -b.$$

Let $\mathbf{s}_i(\mathfrak{r})$ be the ith basic symmetric function in $\mathfrak{r}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{r}_{2g+1}$. Let us put

$$U_{\mathfrak{r}}(x) = (-1)^g\left[(a-x)^g + \sum_{j=1}^{g} \mathbf{s}_{2j}(\mathfrak{r})(a-x)^{g-j}\right],$$

$$V_{\mathfrak{r}}(x) = \left[\sum_{j=1}^{g} \mathbf{s}_{2j-1}(\mathfrak{r})(a-x)^{g-j+1}\right] - b - \mathbf{s}_1(\mathfrak{r})\left[(a-x)^g + \sum_{j=1}^{g} \mathbf{s}_{2j}(\mathfrak{r})(a-x)^{g-j}\right].$$

Then there is a natural bijection between $\mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$ and $M_{1/2,P}$ such that $\mathfrak{r} \in \mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$ corresponds to $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}} \in M_{1/2,P}$ with Mumford's representation $(U_{\mathfrak{r}}, V_{\mathfrak{r}})$. More explicitly, if $\{c_1, \dots, c_g\}$ is the list of g roots (with multiplicities) of $U_{\mathfrak{r}}(x)$ then $\mathfrak{r}$ corresponds to

$$\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}} = \mathrm{cl}(D - g(\infty)) \in J(K),\ 2\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}} = P$$

where the divisor

$$D = D(\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r}) = \sum_{j=1}^{g}(Q_j),\ Q_j = (b_j, V_\mathfrak{r}(b_j)) \in \mathcal{C}(K)\ \forall\ j = 1, \dots, g.$$

In addition, none of α_i is a root of $U_\mathfrak{r}(x)$ (i.e., the polynomials $U_\mathfrak{r}(x)$ and $f(x)$ are relatively prime) and

$$\mathfrak{r}_i = \mathbf{s}_1(\mathfrak{r}) + (-1)^g \frac{V_\mathfrak{r}(\alpha_i)}{U_\mathfrak{r}(\alpha_i)}\ \forall\ i = 1, \dots, 2g+1.$$

Proof. Actually we have already proven all the assertions of Theorem 3.2 except the last formula for $\mathfrak{r}_i$. It follows from (4) and (5) that

$$\mathfrak{r}_i = (-1)^g \frac{v_{D(\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r})}(\alpha_i)}{u_{D(\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r})}(\alpha_i)} = (-1)^g \frac{v_{D(\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r})}(\alpha_i)}{U_\mathfrak{r}(\alpha_i)}.$$

It follows from (12) that

$$v_{D(\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r})}(x) = (-1)^g \mathbf{s}_1(\mathfrak{r}) U_\mathfrak{r}(x) + V_\mathfrak{r}(x).$$

This implies that

$$\mathfrak{r}_i = (-1)^g \frac{(-1)^g \mathbf{s}_1(\mathfrak{r}) U_\mathfrak{r}(\alpha_i) + V_\mathfrak{r}(\alpha_i)}{U_\mathfrak{r}(\alpha_i)} = \mathbf{s}_1(\mathfrak{r}) + (-1)^g \frac{V_\mathfrak{r}(\alpha_i)}{U_\mathfrak{r}(\alpha_i)}.$$

□

Example 3.3. Let us take as $P = (a, b)$ the point $\mathfrak{W}_{2g+1} = (\alpha_{2g+1}, 0)$. Then $b = 0$ and $\mathfrak{r}_{2g+1} = 0$. We have $2g$ arbitrary independent choices of (nonzero) square roots $\mathfrak{r}_j = \sqrt{\alpha_{2g+1} - \alpha_j}$ with $1 \le j \le 2g$ (and always get an element of $\mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$). Now Theorem 3.2 gives us (if we put $a = \alpha_{2j+1}, b = 0$) all 2^{2g} points $\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r}$ of order 4 in $J(K)$ with $2\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{W}_{2j+1}$.

4. Rationality Questions

Let K_0 be a subfield of K and K_0^{sep} its separable algebraic closure in K. Recall that K_0^{sep} is separably closed. Clearly,

$$\mathrm{char}(K_0) = \mathrm{char}(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}) = \mathrm{char}(K) \ne 2.$$

Let us assume that $f(x) \in K_0[x]$, i.e., all the coefficients of $f(x)$ lie in K_0. However, we don't make any additional assumptions about its roots α_j; still, all of them lie in K_0^{sep}, because $f(x)$ has no multiple roots. Recall that both $\mathcal{C}$ and J are defined over K_0; the point $\infty \in \mathcal{C}(K_0)$ and therefore the embedding $\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow J$ is defined over K_0; in particular, $\mathcal{C}$ is a closed algebraic K_0-subvariety of J.

Let us assume that our K-point $P = (a, b)$ of $\mathcal{C}$ lies in $\mathcal{C}(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}})$, i.e., $a, b \in K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}$ and

$$P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}) \subset J(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}) \subset J(K).$$

In the notation of Theorem 3.2, for each $\mathfrak{r} \in M_{1/2,P}$ all its components $\mathfrak{r}_i$ lie in K_0^{sep}, because $\mathfrak{r}_i^2 = a - \alpha_i \in K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}$. This implies that the monic degree $2g+1$ polynomial

$$h_\mathfrak{r}(t) = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1}(t - \mathfrak{r}_i) = t^{2g+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{2g}(-1)^i \mathbf{s}_i(\mathfrak{r}) t^{2g+1-i} \in K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}[t],$$

i.e., all $\mathbf{s}_i(\mathfrak{r}) \in K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}$. It follows immediately from the explicit formulas above that the Mumford representation $(U_{\mathfrak{r}}, V_{\mathfrak{r}})$ of $\mathfrak{a}_r = \mathrm{cl}(D(\mathfrak{a}_r) - g(\infty))$ consists of polynomials $U_{\mathfrak{r}}$ and $V_{\mathfrak{r}}$ with coefficients in K_0^{sep}. In addition, $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}}$ lies in $J(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}})$, because $2\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}} = P \in J(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}})$, the multiplication by 2 in J is an étale map and K_0^{sep} is separably closed.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that either K_0 is a perfect field (e.g., $\mathrm{char}(K) = 0$ or K_0 is finite) or $\mathrm{char}(K_0) > g$. Suppose that*

$$P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}) \subset J(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}).$$

Then for all $\mathfrak{r} \in \mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$ the Mumford representation $(U_{\mathfrak{r}}, V_{\mathfrak{r}})$ of $\mathfrak{a}_r = \mathrm{cl}(D(\mathfrak{a}_r) - g(\infty))$ enjoys the following properties.

(i) *The polynomial $U_{\mathfrak{r}}(x)$ splits over K_0^{sep}, i.e., all its roots b_j lie in K_0^{sep}.*
(ii) *The divisor*

$$D = D(\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}}) = \sum_{j=1}(Q_j)$$

where

$$Q_j = (c_j, V_{\mathfrak{r}}(c_j)) \in \mathcal{C}(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}) \ \forall \ j = 1, \dots, g.$$

Proof. If K_0 is perfect then K_0^{sep} is algebraically closed and there is nothing to prove. So, we may assume that $\mathrm{char}(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}) = \mathrm{char}(K_0) > g$. In order to prove (i), recall that $\deg(U_{\mathfrak{r}}) = g$. Every root c_j of $U_{\mathfrak{r}}(x)$ lies in K and the algebraic field extension $K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}(b_j)/K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}$ has finite degree that does not exceed

$$\deg(U_{\mathfrak{r}}) = g < \mathrm{char}(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}})$$

and therefore this degree is *not* divisible by $\mathrm{char}(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}})$. This implies that the field extension $K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}(b_j)/K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}$ is separable. Since K_0^{sep} is separably closed, the overfield $K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}(c_j) = K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}$, i.e., c_j lies in K_0^{sep}. This proves (i). As for (ii), since $V_{\mathfrak{r}}(x) \in K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}[x]$ and all $c_j \in K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}$, we have $V_{\mathfrak{r}}(c_j) \in K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}$ and therefore $Q_j = (c_j, V_{\mathfrak{r}}(c_j)) \in \mathcal{C}(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}})$. This proves (ii). □

Remark 4.2. If $g = 2$ then the conditions of Lemma 4.1 do not impose any additional restrictions on K_0. (The case $\mathrm{char}(K) = 2$ was excluded from the very beginning.)

Remark 4.3. If $P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K_0)$ then for each $\mathfrak{r} \in \mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$

$$\mathbf{s}_{2g+1}(\mathfrak{r}) = (-1)^{2g+1} \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} \mathfrak{r}_i = -\prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} \mathfrak{r}_i = -(-b) = b \in K_0.$$

This observation (reminder) explains the omission of $i = 2g + 1$ in the following statement.

Theorem 4.4. *Suppose that a point*

$$P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K_0) \subset J(K_0),$$

i.e.,

$$a, b \in K_0, \ b^2 = f(a).$$

If $\mathfrak{r}$ is an element of $\mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$ then $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}}$ lies in $J(K_0)$ if and only if $h_{\mathfrak{r}}(t)$ lies in $K_0[t]$, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{s}_i(\mathfrak{r}) \in K_0 \ \forall \ i = 1, \dots, 2g.$$

Proof. Let $\bar{K}_0$ be the algebraic closure of K_0. Clearly, $\bar{K}_0$ is algebraically closed and

$$K_0 \subset K_0^{\mathrm{sep}} \subset \bar{K}_0 \subset K.$$

In the course of the proof we may and will assume that $K = \bar{K}_0$.

Let $\mathfrak{r}$ be an element of$\mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$. We know that $\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r} \in J(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}})$ and the corresponding polynomials $U_\mathfrak{r}(x)$ and $V_\mathfrak{r}(x)$ have coefficients in K_0^{sep}. This means that there is a finite Galois field extension E/K_0 with Galois group $\mathrm{Gal}(E/K)$ such that

$$K_0 \subset E \subset K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}$$

such that

$$\mathfrak{a}_{rr} \in J(E);\ U_\mathfrak{r}(x), V_\mathfrak{r}(x) \in E[x].$$

Let $\mathrm{Aut}(K/K_0)$ be the group of all field automorphisms of K that leave invariant every element of K_0. Clearly, the (sub)field E is $\mathrm{Aut}(K/K_0)$-stable and the natural (restriction) group homomorphism

$$\mathrm{Aut}(K/K_0) \to \mathrm{Gal}(E/K_0)$$

is *surjective*. Since the subfield $E^{\mathrm{Gal}(E/K_0)}$ of Galois invariants coincides with K_0, we conclude that the subfield of invariants $E^{\mathrm{Aut}(K/K_0)}$ also coincides with K_0. It follows that

$$E[x]^{\mathrm{Aut}(K/K_0)} = K_0[x],\ J(E)^{\mathrm{Aut}(K/K_0)} = J(K_0).$$

Clearly, for each $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(K/K_0)$ the Mumford representation of $\sigma\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r}$ is $(\sigma U_\mathfrak{r}, \sigma V_\mathfrak{r})$.

Now let us assume that $\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r} \in J(K_0)$. Then

$$\sigma\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r}\ \forall\ \sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(K/K_0).$$

The uniqueness of Mumford's representations implies that

$$\sigma U_\mathfrak{r}(x) = U_\mathfrak{r}(x),\ \sigma V_\mathfrak{r}(x) = V_\mathfrak{r}(x)\ \forall\ \sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(K/K_0).$$

It follows that

$$U_\mathfrak{r}(x), V_\mathfrak{r}(x) \in K_0[x].$$

Taking into account that $a, b \in K_0$, we obtain from the formulas in Theorem 3.2 that

$$\mathbf{s}_i(\mathfrak{r}) \in K_0\ \forall\ i = 1, \dots, 2g.$$

Conversely, let us assume that for a certain $\mathfrak{r} \in \mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$

$$\mathbf{s}_i(\mathfrak{r}) \in K_0\ \forall\ i = 1, \dots, 2g.$$

(We know that $\mathbf{s}_{2g+1}(\mathfrak{r})$ also lies in K_0.) This implies that both $U_\mathfrak{r}(x)$ and $V_\mathfrak{r}(x)$ lie in $K_0[x]$. In other words,

$$\sigma U_\mathfrak{r}(x) = U_\mathfrak{r}(x),\ \sigma V_\mathfrak{r}(x) = V_\mathfrak{r}(x)\ \forall\ \sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(K/K_0).$$

This means that for every $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(K/K_0)$ both $\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r}$ and $\sigma\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r}$ have the same Mumford representation, namely, $(U_\mathfrak{r}, V_\mathfrak{r})$. This implies that

$$\sigma\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r}\ \forall\ \sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(K/K_0),$$

i.e.,

$$\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r} \in J(E)^{\mathrm{Aut}(K/K_0)} = J(K_0).$$

□

Theorem 4.5. *Suppose that a point*

$$P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K_0) \subset J(K_0),$$

i.e.,

$$a, b \in K_0,\ b^2 = f(a).$$

Then the following conditions are equivalent.

(i) $\alpha_i \in K_0$ *and* $a - \alpha_i$ *is a square in* K_0 *for all* i *with* $1 \le i \le 2g+1$.
(ii) *All* 2^{2g} *elements* $\mathfrak{a} \in J(K)$ *with* $2\mathfrak{a} = P$ *actually lie in* $J(K_0)$.

Proof. Assume (i). Then $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r}$ for a certain $\mathfrak{r} \in \mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$. Our assumptions imply that all $\mathfrak{r}_i = \sqrt{a - \alpha_i}$ lie in K_0 and therefore

$$\mathbf{s}_i(\mathfrak{r}) \in K_0\ \forall\ i = 1, \dots, 2g.$$

Now Theorem 4.4 tells us that $\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r} \in J(K_0)$. This proves (ii).

Assume (ii). It follows from Theorem 4.4 that $\mathbf{s}_i(\mathfrak{r}) \in K_0$ for all $\mathfrak{r} \in \mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$ and i with $1 \le i \le 2g+1$. In particular, for $i = 1$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} \mathfrak{r}_i = \mathbf{s}_1(\mathfrak{r}) \in K_0\ \forall\ \mathfrak{r} \in \mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}.$$

Pick any $\mathfrak{r} \in \mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$ and for *any* index l ($1 \le l \le 2j+1$) consider $\mathfrak{r}^{(l)} \in \mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$ such that

$$\mathfrak{r}^{(l)}_l = \mathfrak{r}_l,\ \mathfrak{r}^{(l)}_i = -\mathfrak{r}_i\ \forall i \ne l.$$

We have

$$\mathbf{s}_1(\mathfrak{r}) \in K_0,\ -2\mathbf{s}_1(\mathfrak{r}) + 2\mathfrak{r}_l = \mathbf{s}_1(\mathfrak{r}^{(l)}) \in K_0.$$

This implies that $\mathfrak{r}_l \in K_0$. Since $\mathfrak{r}_\ell^2 = a - \alpha_l$ and $a \in K_0$, we conclude that α_l lies in K_0 and $a - \alpha_l$ is a square in K_0. This proves (i). □

Remark 4.6. In the case of elliptic curves (i/e., when $g = 1$) Theorem 4.5 is well known, see, e.g., [5, p. 269–270].

The following assertion was inspired by results of Schaefer [14].

Theorem 4.7. *Let us consider the* $(2g+1)$*-dimensional commutative semisimple* K_0*-algebra* $L = K_0[x]/f(x)K_0[x]$.

A K_0*-point* $P = (a, b)$ *on* $\mathcal{C}$ *is divisible by* 2 *in* $J(K_0)$ *if and only if*

$$(a - x) + f(x)K_0[x] \in K_0[x]/f(x)K_0[x] = L$$

is a square in L.

Proof. For each $q(x) \in K_0[x]$ we write $\overline{q(x)}$ for its image in $K_0[x]/f(x)K_0[x]$.

For each $i = 1, \dots 2g+1$ there is a homomorphism of K_0-algebras

$$\phi_i : L = K_0[x]/f(x)K_0[x] \to K_0^{\mathrm{sep}},\ \overline{q(x)} = q(x) + f(x)K_0[x] \mapsto q(\alpha_i);$$

the intersection of the kernels of all ϕ_i is $\{0\}$. Indeed, if $\overline{q(x)} \in \ker(\phi_i)$ then $q(x)$ is divisible by $x - \alpha_i$ and therefore if $\overline{q(x)}$ lies in $\ker(\phi_i)$ for all i then $q(x)$ is divisible by $\prod_{i=1}^{2g+1}(x - \alpha_i) = f(x)$, i.e., $\overline{q(x)} = 0$ in $K_0[x]/f(x)K_0[x]$. Clearly,

$$\phi_i(\bar{x}) = \alpha_i,\ \phi_i(\overline{a - x}) = a - \alpha_i.$$

Since $f(x)$ lies in $K_0[x]$, the set of its roots $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2g+1}\}$ is a Galois-stable subset of K_0^{sep}. This implies that for each $q(x) \in K_0[x]$ and

$$\mathcal{Z} = \overline{q(x)} \in K_0[x]/f(x)K_0[x]$$

the product

$$\mathrm{H}_{\mathcal{Z}}(t) = H_{q(x)}(t) := \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} \left(t - \phi_i(\overline{q(x)}\right) = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (t - q(\alpha_i))$$

is a degree $(2g+1)$ monic polynomial with coefficients in K_0. In particular, if $q(x) = a - x$ then

$$H_{a-x}(t) = \mathrm{H}_{\overline{a-x}}(t) = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} [t - (a - \alpha_i)].$$

Assume that P is divisible by 2 in $J(K_0)$, i.e., there is $\mathfrak{a} \in J(K_0)$ with $2\mathfrak{a} = P$. It follows from Theorems 3.2 and 4.4 that there is $\mathfrak{r} \in \mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$ such that $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}} = \mathfrak{a}$ and all $\mathbf{s}_i(\mathfrak{r})$ lie in K_0. This implies that both polynomials $U_{\mathfrak{r}}(x)$ and $V_{\mathfrak{r}}(x)$ have coefficients in $K_0[x]$. Recall (Theorem 3.2) that $f(x)$ and $U_{\mathfrak{r}}(x)$ are relatively prime. This means that $\overline{U_{\mathfrak{r}}(x)} = U_{\mathfrak{r}}(\bar{x})$ is a *unit* in $K_0[x]/f(x)K_0[x]$. Therefore we may define

$$\mathcal{R} = \mathbf{s}_1(\mathfrak{r}) + (-1)^g \frac{V_{\mathfrak{r}}(\bar{x})}{U_{\mathfrak{r}}(\bar{x})} \in K_0[x]/f(x)K_0[x].$$

The last formula of Theorem 3.2 implies that for all i we have $\phi_i(\mathcal{R}) = \mathfrak{r}_i$ and therefore

$$\phi_i(\mathcal{R}^2) = \mathfrak{r}_i^2 = a - \alpha_i = \phi_i(a - \bar{x}).$$

This implies that $\mathcal{R}^2 = a - \bar{x}$. It follows that

$$a - \bar{x} = (a - x) + f(t)K_0[t] \in K_0[x]/f(x)K_0[x]$$

is a *square* in $K_0[x]/f(x)K_0[x]$.

Conversely, assume now that there is an element $\mathcal{R} \in L$ such that

$$\mathcal{R}^2 = a - \bar{x} = \overline{a - x}.$$

This implies that

$$\phi_i(\mathcal{R})^2 = \phi_i(\overline{a - x}) = a - \alpha_i,$$

i.e.,

$$\phi_i(\mathcal{R}) = \sqrt{a - \alpha_i} \ \forall \ i = 1, \dots, 2g+1.$$

This implies that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} \phi_i(\mathcal{R}) = \sqrt{f(a)} = \pm b.$$

Since $(-1)^{2g+1} = -1$, replacing if necessary, $\mathcal{R}$ by $-\mathcal{R}$, we may and will assume that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} \phi_i(\mathcal{R}) = -b.$$

Now if we put

$$\mathfrak{r}_i = \phi_i(\mathcal{R}) \ \forall \ i = 1, \dots, 2g+1; \ \mathfrak{r} = (\mathfrak{r}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{r}_{2g+1})$$

then $\mathfrak{r} \in \mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$ and

$$h_{\mathfrak{r}}(t) = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (t - \mathfrak{r}_i) = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (t - \phi_i(\mathcal{R})) = \mathrm{H}_{\mathcal{R}}(t).$$

Since $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{R}}(t)$ lies in $K_0[t]$, the polynomial $h_{\mathfrak{r}}(t)$ also lies in $K_0[t]$. It follows from Theorem 4.4 that $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}} \in J(K_0)$. Since $2\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}} = P$, the point P is divisible by 2 in $J(K_0)$. □

Remark 4.8. If one assumes additionally that $\mathrm{char}(K_0) = 0$ and P is none of $\mathfrak{W}_i$ (i.e., $a \ne \alpha_i$ for any i) then the assertion of Theorem 4.7 follows from [14, Th. 1.2 and the first paragraph of p. 224].

5. Torsion points on Θ_d

We keep the notation of Section 4. In particular, K_0 be a subfield of K such that

$$f(x) \in K_0[x].$$

Notice that the involution ι is also defined over K_0, the absolute Galois group $\mathrm{Gal}(K_0)$ leaves invariant ∞ and permutes points of $\mathcal{C}(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}})$; in addition, it permutes elements of $J(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}})$, respecting the group structure on $J(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}})$.

If n is a positive integer that is *not* divisible by $\mathrm{char}(K)$ then we write $J[n]$ for the kernel of multiplication by n in $J(K)$. It is well known that $J[n]$ is a free $Z/n\mathbb{Z}$-module of rank $2g$ that lies in $J(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}})$; in addition, it is a $\mathrm{Gal}(K_0)$-stable subgroup of $J(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}})$, which gives us the (continuous) group homomorphism

$$\rho_{n,,J} : \mathrm{Gal}(K_0) \to \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}}(J[n])$$

that defines the Galois action on $J[n]$. We write $\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}$ for the image

$$\rho_{n,J}(\mathrm{Gal}(K_0)) \subset \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}}(J[n]).$$

Let Id_n be the identity automorphism of $J[n]$. The following assertion was inspired by a work of F. Bogomolov [4] (where the ℓ-primary part of the Manin-Mumford conjecture was proven).

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose that $g > 1$ and $n \ge 3$ is an integer that is not divisible by $\mathrm{char}(K)$. Let $N > 1$ be an integer that is relatively prime to n and such that $N \le 2g - 1$ and $\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}$ contains either $N \cdot \mathrm{Id}_n$ or $-N \cdot \mathrm{Id}_n$. Let us put $d(N) := [2g/(N+1)]$.*

Then $\Theta_{d(N)}(K)$ does not contain nonzero points of order dividing n except points of order 1 or 2. In particular, if n is odd then $\Theta_{d(N)}(K)$ does not contain nonzero points of order dividing n.

Proof. Clearly, $(N+1) \cdot d(N) < 2g + 1$. Suppose that $\mathfrak{b}$ is a nonzero point of order dividing n in $\Theta_{d(N)}(K)$. We need to prove that $2\mathfrak{b} = 0$.

Indeed, $\mathfrak{b} \in J[n] \subset J(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}})$ and therefore

$$\mathfrak{b} \in \Theta_d(K) \bigcap J(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}) = \Theta_d(K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}).$$

By our assumption, there is $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(K)$ such that $\sigma(\mathfrak{a}) = N\mathfrak{a}$ or $-N\mathfrak{a}$ for all $\mathfrak{a} \in J[n]$. This implies that $\sigma(\mathfrak{b}) = N\mathfrak{b}$ or $-N\mathfrak{b}$. It follows from Theorem 2.8 that $2\mathfrak{b} = 0$ in $J(K)$. □

Example 5.2. Suppose that K is the field $\mathbb{C}$ of complex numbers, $g = 2$ and $\mathcal{C}$ is the genus 2 curve

$$y^2 = x^5 - x + 1.$$

Let us put $N = 2$. Then $d(N) = 2$. Let $n = \ell$ be an *odd* prime. Then $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ is the prime field $\mathbb{F}_\ell$. Results of L. Dieulefait [6, Th. 5.8 on pp. 509–510] and Serre's

Modularity Conjecture [18] that was proven by C. Khare and J.-P. Wintenberger [8] imply that $\tilde{G}_{\ell,J,K_0}$ is "as large as possible"; in particular, it contains all the homotheties $\mathbb{F}_\ell^* \cdot \mathrm{Id}_\ell$. This implies that $\tilde{G}_{\ell,J,K_0}$ contains $2 \cdot \mathrm{Id}_\ell$, since ℓ is odd. It follows from Corollary 5.1 that $\Theta_1 = \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{C})$ does *not* contain points of order ℓ for *all odd primes* ℓ.

Actually, using his algorithm mentioned above, B. Poonen had already checked that the only torsion points on this curve are the Weierstrass points $\mathfrak{W}_i$ (of order 2) and ∞ (of order 1) [10, Sect. 14].

Notice that the Galois group of $x^5 - x + 1$ over $\mathbb{Q}$ is the full symmetruc group $\mathbf{S}_5$. This implies that the ring of $\mathbb{C}$-endomorphisms of J coincides with $\mathbb{Z}$ [23]. In particular, J is an absolutely simple abelian surface.

Theorem 5.3. *Suppose that $g > 1$, $K_0 = \mathbb{Q}, K = \mathbb{C}$ and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2g+1} \in \mathbb{C}$ are algebraically independent (transcendental) elements of $\mathbb{C}$ (i.e.,*

$$\mathcal{C} : y^2 = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (x - \alpha_i)$$

is a generic hyperelliptic curve). Then:

(i) *$\Theta_{[2g/3]}(\mathbb{C})$ does not contain nonzero points of odd order.*
(ii) *All 2-power torsion points in $\Theta_{[g/2]}(\mathbb{C})$ have order 1 or 2.*

We will prove Theorems 5.3 in Section 6.

Remark 5.4. Let $K_0, K = \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ be as in Theorem 5.3.

(i) B. Poonen and M. Stoll [11, Th. 7.1] proved that the only torsion points on this generic curve are the Weierstrass points $\mathfrak{W}_i$ (of order 2) and ∞ (of order 1).
(ii) Let $s_1, \dots, s_{2g+1} \in \mathbb{C}$ be the corresponding basic symmetric functions in $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2g+1}$ and let us consider the (sub)field

$$L := \mathbb{Q}(s_1, \dots, s_{2g+1} \subset \mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2g+1}) = K_0.$$

Then $f(x)$ lies in $L[x]$ and its Galois group over L is the full symmetric group $\mathbf{S}_{2g+1}$. This implies that the ring of $\mathbb{C}$-endomorphisms of J coincides with $\mathbb{Z}$ [23]. In particular, J is an absolutely *simple* abelian variety. (Of course, this result is well known.) It follows from the generalized Manin-Mumford conjecture (also proven by M. Raynaud [13]) that the set of torsion points on $\Theta_d(\mathbb{C})$ is finite for all $d < g$.

6. Abelian varieties with big ℓ-adic Galoid images

We need to recall some basic facts about fields of definition of torsion points on abelian varieties.

Recall that a positive integer n is *not* divisible by $\mathrm{char}(K)$ and the rank $2g$ free $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$-module $J[n]$ lies in $J(K^{\mathrm{sep}})$. Clearly, all nth roots of unity of K lie in K^{sep}. We write μ_n for the order n cyclic multiplicative group of nth roots of unity in K^{sep}. We write $K(\mu_n) \subset K^{\mathrm{sep}}$ for the nth *cyclotomic* field extension of K and

$$\chi_n : \mathrm{Gal}(K) \to (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^*$$

for the nth *cyclotomic* character that defines the Galois action on all nth roots of unity. The Galois group $\mathrm{Gal}(K(\mu_n)/K)$ of the abelian extension $K(\mu_n/K$ is

canonically isomorphic to the image

$$\chi_n(\mathrm{Gal}(K)) \subset (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^* = \mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}(\mu_n)/\mathbb{Q});$$

the equality holds if and only if the degree $[K(\mu_n) : K]$ coincides with $\phi(n)$ where ϕ is the *Euler function*. For example, if K is the field $\mathbb{Q}$ of rational numbers then for all n

$$[\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n) : \mathbb{Q}] = \phi(n),\ \chi_n(\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{Q})) = (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^*.$$

The Jacobian J carries the canonical principal polarization that is defined over K_0 and gives rise to a nondegenerate alternating bilinear form (Weil-Riemann pairing)

$$\bar{e}_n : J[n] \times J[n] \to \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$$

such that for all $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(K)$ and $\mathfrak{a}_1, \mathfrak{a}_2 \in J[n]$ we have

$$\bar{e}_n(\sigma\mathfrak{a}_1, \sigma\mathfrak{a}_2) = \chi_n(\sigma) \cdot \bar{e}_n(\mathfrak{a}_1, \mathfrak{a}_2).$$

(Such a form is defined uniquely up to multiplication by an element of $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ and depends on a choice between of an isomorphism between μ_n and $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$.)

Let

$$\mathrm{Gp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n) \subset \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}}(J[n])$$

be the group of symplectic similitudes of $\bar{e}_n$ that consists of all automorphisms u of $J[n]$ such that there exists a constant $c = c(u) \in (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^*$ such that

$$\bar{e_n}\bar{e}_n(u\mathfrak{a}_1, u\mathfrak{a}_2) = c(u) \cdot \bar{e_n}\bar{e}_n(\mathfrak{a}_1, \mathfrak{a}_2)\ \forall \mathfrak{a}_1, \mathfrak{a}_2 \in J[n].$$

The map

$$\mathrm{mult}_n : \mathrm{Gp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n) \to (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^*,\ u \mapsto c(u)$$

is a surjective group homomorphism, whose kernel coincides with the *symplectic group*

$$\mathrm{Sp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n) \cong \mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{F}_\ell)$$

of $\bar{e}_n$. Both $\mathrm{Sp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n)$ and the group of homotheties $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})\mathrm{Id}_n$ are subgroups of $\mathrm{Gp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n)$. The Galois-equivariance of the Weil-Riemann pairing implies that

$$\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0} \subset \mathrm{Gp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n) \subset \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}}(J[n]).$$

It is also clear that for each $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(K)$

$$\chi_n(\sigma) = c(\rho_{n,J.K_0}(\sigma)) = \mathrm{mult}_n(\rho_{n,J.K_0}(\sigma)) \in (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^*.$$

Since $\mathrm{Sp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n) = \ker(\mathrm{mult}_n)$, we obtain the following useful assertion.

Lemma 6.1. *Let us assume that $\chi_n(\mathrm{Gal}(K)) = (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^*$ (E.g., $K = \mathbb{Q}$ or the field $\mathbb{Q}(t_1, \dots t_d)$ of rational functions in d independent varibles over $\mathbb{Q}$.)*

Suppose that $\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}$ contains $\mathrm{Sp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n)$. Then $\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0} = \mathrm{Gp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n)$. In particular, $\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}$ contains the whole group of homotheties $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^* \cdot \mathrm{Id}_n$.

Example 6.2. Let K_0, $K = \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ be as in Theorem 5.3, i.e., $\mathcal{C}$ is a *generic hyperelliptic curve*.

(i) B. Poonen and M. Stoll proved [11, Proof of Th. 7.1] that if n is odd then $\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}$ contains $\mathrm{Sp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n)$. It follows from Lemma 6.1 that $\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0} = \mathrm{Gp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n)$ for all *odd* n. In particular, it contains $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^* \cdot \mathrm{Id}_n$ and therefore contains $2 \cdot \mathrm{Id}_n$.

(ii) Let us assume that $n = 2^e$ is a a power of 2. J. Yelton [22] proved that that $\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}$ contains the level 2 *congruence subgroup* $\Gamma(2)$ of $\mathrm{Sp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n)$ defined by the condition

$$\Gamma(2) = \{g \in \mathrm{Sp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n) \mid g \equiv \mathrm{Id}_n \bmod 2\} \lhd \mathrm{Sp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n).$$

Let us consider the level 2 *congruence subgroup* $G\Gamma(2)$ of $\mathrm{Gp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n)$ defined by the condition

$$G\Gamma(2) = \{g \in \mathrm{Gp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n) \mid g \equiv \mathrm{Id}_n \bmod 2\} \lhd \mathrm{Gp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n).$$

Clearly, $G\Gamma(2)$ contains $3{\cdot}\mathrm{Id}_n$ while the intersection of $G\Gamma(2)$ and $\mathrm{Sp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n)$ coincides with $\Gamma(2)$. The latter means that $\Gamma(2)$ coincides with the kernel of the restriction of mult_n to $G\Gamma(2)$. In addition,one may easily check that

$$\mathrm{mult}_n(G\Gamma(2)) = (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^* = \mathrm{mult}_n(\mathrm{Gp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n),$$

since

$$(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^* = \{c \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) \mid c \equiv 1 \bmod 2\}.$$

This implies that $\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}$ contains $G\Gamma(2)$. In particular, $\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}$ contains $3 \cdot \mathrm{Id}_n$. (See also [11, Proof of Th. 7.1].)

Proof of Theorem 5.3. Recall that $d(2) = [2g/3]$. Combining Theorem 5.1 (with $N = 2$ and any *odd* n) with Example 6.2(i), we conclude that $\Theta_{[2g/3]}(\mathbb{C})$ does *not* contain nonzero points of odd order n. This proves (i).

Recall that $d(3) = [2g/4] = [g/2]$. Combining Theorem 5.1 (with $N = 3$ and $n = 2^e$) with Example 6.2(ii), we conclude that all 2-power torsion points in $\Theta_{[g/2]}(\mathbb{C})$ are points of order 1 or 2. □

The rest of this paper is devoted to the proof of the following result.

Theorem 6.3. *Let K_0 be the field $\mathbb{Q}$ of rational numbers, $K = \mathbb{C}$ the field of complex numbers. Suppose that $g > 1$. Let S be a non-empty set of odd primes such that for all $\ell \in S$ the image $\tilde{G}_{\ell,J,K_0} = \mathrm{Gp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell)$.*

If $n > 1$ is a positive odd integer, all whose prime divisors lie in S then $\Theta_{[2g/3]}(\mathbb{C})$ does not contain nonzero points of order dividing n.

Let us start with the following elementary observation on Galois properties of torsion points on J.

Remark 6.4. (i) Let $\tilde{G}_n$ be the *derived subgroup* $[\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}, \tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}]$ of $\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}$. Then $\tilde{G}_n$ is a normal subgroup of finite index in $\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}$. Let $K_{0,n} \subset K_0^{\mathrm{sep}}$ be the finite Galois extension of K_0 such that the absolute Galois (sub)group $\mathrm{Gal}(K_{0,n}) \subset \mathrm{Gal}(K_0)$ coincides with the *preimage*

$$\rho_{n,J}^{-1}(\tilde{G}_n)) \subset \rho_{n,J}^{-1}(\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}) = \mathrm{Gal}(K).$$

We have

$$\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_{0,n}} = \rho_{n,J}(\mathrm{Gal}(K_{0,n})) =$$

$$\tilde{G}_n = [\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}, \tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}] \subset [\mathrm{Gp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n), \mathrm{Gp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n)] \subset \mathrm{Sp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n).$$

This implies that

$$\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_{0,n}} \subset \mathrm{Sp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n).$$

Let $m > 1$ be an integer dividing n. The inclusion of Galois modules $J[m] \subset J[n]$ induces the *surjective* group homomorphisms

$$\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0} \twoheadrightarrow \tilde{G}_{m,J,K_0},\ \tilde{G}_{n,J,K_{0,n}} \twoheadrightarrow \tilde{G}_{m,J,K_{0,n}} \subset \tilde{G}_{m,J,K_0};$$

the latter homomorphism coincides with the restriction of the former one to the (derived) subgroup $\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_{0,n}} \subset \tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}$. This implies that

$$\tilde{G}_{m,J,K_{0,n}} = [\tilde{G}_{m,J,K_0}, \tilde{G}_{m,J,K_0}]$$

is the derived subgroup of $\tilde{G}_{m,J,K_0}$. In addition,

$$\tilde{G}_{m,J,K_{0,n}} = [\tilde{G}_{m,J,K_0}, \tilde{G}_{m,J,K_0}] \subset [\mathrm{Gp}(J[m], \bar{e}_m), \mathrm{Gp}(J[m], \bar{e}_m)] \subset \mathrm{Sp}(J[m], \bar{e}_m).$$

(ii) Recall that $g \geq 2$. Now assume that $m = \ell$ is an odd prime dividing n. Then $\mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell)$ is *perfect*, i.e., coincides with its own derived subgroup. Assume also that $\tilde{G}_{\ell,J,K_0})$ contains $\mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell)$. Then

$$\mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell) \supset \tilde{G}_{\ell,J,K_{0,n}} =$$

$$[\tilde{G}_{\ell,J,K_0}), \tilde{G}_{\ell,J,K_0}) \supset [\mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell), \mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell)] = \mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell)$$

and therefore

$$\tilde{G}_{\ell,J,K_{0,n}} = \mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell).$$

We will also need the following result about closed subgroups of *symplectic groups* over the ring $\mathbb{Z}_\ell$ of ℓ-adic integers ([17, pp. 52–53], [20, Th. 1.3]).

Lemma 6.5. *Let $g \geq 2$ be an integer and ℓ an odd prime. Let G be a closed subroup of $\mathrm{Sp}(2g, \mathbb{Z}_\ell)$ such that the corresponding reduction map $G \to \mathrm{Sp}(2g, \mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})$ is surjective. Then $G = \mathrm{Sp}(2g, \mathbb{Z}_\ell)$.*

Proof. The result follows from [20, Theorem 1.3 on pp. 326–327] applied to

$$p = q = \ell, k = \mathbb{F}_\ell, W(k) = \mathbb{Z}_\ell, G = \mathrm{Sp}_{2g}.$$

□

Corollary 6.6. *Let $g \geq 2$ be an integer and ℓ an odd prime. Then for each positive integer i the group $\mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}/\ell^i\mathbb{Z})$ is perfect.*

Proof. The case $i = 1$ is well known. Let $i \geq 1$ be an integer. It is also well known that the reduction modulo ℓ^i map

$$\mathrm{red}_i : \mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}_\ell) \to \mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}/\ell^i\mathbb{Z})$$

is a *surjective* group homomorphism. This implies that the reduction modulo ℓ map

$$\overline{\mathrm{red}}_{i,1} : \mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}/\ell^i\mathbb{Z}) \to \mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})$$

is also a *surjective* group homomorphism. Clearly, red_1 coincides with the composition $\overline{\mathrm{red}}_{i,1} \circ \mathrm{red}_i$.

Suppose that $\mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}/\ell^i\mathbb{Z})$ is *not* perfect and let

$$H := [\mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}/\ell^i\mathbb{Z}), \mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}/\ell^i\mathbb{Z})]$$

be the derived subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}/\ell^i\mathbb{Z})$. Since $\mathrm{Sp}(2g, \mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})$ is perfect, i.e., coincides with its derived subgroup,

$$\overline{\mathrm{red}}_{i,1}(H) = \mathrm{Sp}(2g, \mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z}).$$

Now the closed subgroup

$$G := \mathrm{red}_i^{-1}(H) \subset \mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}_\ell)$$

maps surjectively on $\mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})$ but does *not* coincide with $\mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}_\ell)$, because H is a *proper* subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}/\ell^i\mathbb{Z})$ and $\overline{\mathrm{red}}_{i,1}$ is surjective. This contradicts to Lemma 6.5, which proves the desired perfectness. □

The following lemma will be proven at the end of this section.

Lemma 6.7. *Suppose that $g > 1$. Suppose that $n > 1$ is an odd integer that is not divisible by $\mathrm{char}(K)$. If for all primes ℓ dividing n the image $\tilde{G}_{\ell,J,K_0}$ contains $\mathrm{Sp}(J[n], \bar{e}_\ell)$ then $\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}$ contains $\mathrm{Sp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n)$.*

In addition, if K_0 is the field $\mathbb{Q}$ of rational numbers then

$$\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0} = \mathrm{Gp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n).$$

Remark 6.8. Thanks to Lemma 6.1, the second assertion of Lemma 6.7 follows from the first one.

Proof of Theorem 6.3. Recall that $\mathrm{Gp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell)$ contains $\mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell)$. It follows from Lemma 6.7 that

$$\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0} = \mathrm{Gp}(J[n], \bar{e}_n).$$

This implies that $\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}$ contains $2\cdot\mathrm{Id}_n$, because it contains the whole $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^*\mathrm{Id}_n$. It follows from Corollary 5.1 that $\mathcal{C}(K)$ does not contain points of order n. □

Proof of Lemma 6.7. First, let us do the case when n is a power of an *odd* prime ℓ.

Let $\ell \neq \mathrm{char}(K)$ be a prime. Let $T_\ell(J)$ be the ℓ-adic Tate module of J that is the projective limit of $J[\ell^i]$ where the transition maps $J[\ell^{i+1}] \to J[\ell^i]$ are multiplications by ℓ. It is well known that $T_\ell(J)$ is a free $\mathbb{Z}_\ell$-module of rank $2g$, the Galois actions on $J[\ell^i]$'s are glued together to the continuous group homomorphism

$$\rho_{\ell,J,K_0} : \mathrm{Gal}(K) \to \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathbb{Z}_\ell}(T_\ell(J))$$

such that the canonical isomorphisms of $\mathbb{Z}_\ell$-modules

$$T_\ell(J)/\ell^i T_\ell(J) = J[\ell^i]$$

become isomorphisms of Galois modules. (Recall that $\mathbb{Z}/\ell^i\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z}_\ell/\ell^i\mathbb{Z}_\ell$.) The polarization λ gives rise to the alternating perfect/unimodular $\mathbb{Z}_\ell$-bilinear form

$$e_\ell : T_\ell(J) \times T_\ell(J) \to \mathbb{Z}_\ell$$

such that for each $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(K)$

$$e_\ell(\rho_\ell(\sigma)(v_1), \rho_\ell(\sigma)(v_2)) = \chi_\ell(\sigma) \cdot e_\ell(v_1, v_2) \ \forall\ v_1, v_2 \in T_\ell(J).$$

Here

$$\chi_\ell : \mathrm{Gal}(K) \to \mathbb{Z}_\ell^*$$

is the (continuous) *cyclotomic* character of $\mathrm{Gal}(K)$ characterized by the property

$$\chi_\ell(\sigma) \bmod \ell^i = \bar{\chi}_{\ell^i}(\sigma) \ \forall\ i.$$

This implies that

$$G_{\ell,J,K_0} = \rho_{\ell,J,K_0}\mathrm{Gal}(K)) \subset \mathrm{Gp}(T_\ell(J), e_\ell$$

where

$$\mathrm{Gp}(T_\ell(J), e_\ell) \subset \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathbb{Z}_\ell}(T_\ell(J))$$

is the group of symplectic similitudes of e_ℓ. Clearly, $\mathrm{Gp}(T_\ell(J), e_\ell)$ contains the corresponding *symplectic group*

$$\mathrm{Sp}(T_\ell(J), e_\ell) \cong \mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}_\ell)$$

and the subgroup of *homotheties/scalars* $\mathbb{Z}_\ell^*$. It is also clear that the *derived subgroup* $[\mathrm{Gp}(T_\ell(J), e_\ell), \mathrm{Gp}(T_\ell(J), e_\ell)]$ lies in $\mathrm{Sp}(T_\ell(J), e_\ell)$.

For each $n = \ell^i$ the *reduction map* modulo ℓ^i sends $\mathrm{Gp}(T_\ell(J), e_\ell)$ *onto* $\mathrm{Gp}(J[\ell^i], \bar{e}_{\ell^i})$, $\mathrm{Sp}(T_\ell(J), e_\ell)$ *onto* $\mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell^i], \bar{e}_{\ell^i})$ and $\mathbb{Z}_\ell^*$ *onto* $(\mathbb{Z}/\ell^i\mathbb{Z})^* \cdot \mathrm{Id}_{\ell^i}$. In particular, if ℓ is *odd* then the *scalar* $2 \in \mathbb{Z}_\ell^*$ goes to

$$2 \cdot \mathrm{Id}_{\ell^i} \in \mathrm{Gp}(J[\ell^i], \bar{e}_{\ell^i}).$$

As for G_{ℓ,J,K_0}, its image under the reduction map modulo ℓ^i coincides with $\tilde{G}_{\ell^i,J,K_0}$. It is known [15] that G_{ℓ,J,K_0} is a compact ℓ-adic Lie subgroup in $\mathrm{Gp}(T_\ell(J), e_\ell)$ and therefore is a *closed subgroup* of $\mathrm{Gp}(T_\ell(J), e_\ell)$ with respect to ℓ-adic topology. Clearly, the intersection

$$G_\ell := G_{\ell,J,K_0} \bigcap \mathrm{Sp}(T_\ell(J), e_\ell)$$

is a closed subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}(T_\ell(J), e_\ell)$. In addition, the *derived subgroup* of G_{ℓ,J,K_0}

$$[G_{\ell,J,K_0}, G_{\ell,J,K_0}] \subset G_{\ell,J,K_0} \bigcap [\mathrm{Gp}(T_\ell(J), e_\ell), \mathrm{Gp}(T_\ell(J), e_\ell)] \subset G_{\ell,J,K_0} \bigcap \mathrm{Sp}(T_\ell(J), e_\ell) = G_\ell,$$

i.e.,

$$[G_{\ell,J,K_0}, G_{\ell,J,K_0}] \subset G_\ell.$$

Let us assume that ℓ is *odd* and $\tilde{G}_{\ell,J,K_0}$ contains $\mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell)$. Then the reduction modulo ℓ of $[G_{\ell,J,K_0}, G_{\ell,J,K_0}]$ contains the *derived subgroup* $[\mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell), \mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell)]$. Since our assumptions on g and ℓ imply that the group $\mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell)$ is *perfect*, i.e.,

$$[\mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell), \mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell)] = \mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell),$$

the reduction modulo ℓ of $[G_{\ell,J,K_0}, G_{\ell,J,K_0}]$ contains $\mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell)$. This implies that the reduction modulo ℓ of G_ℓ also contains $\mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell)$. Since G_ℓ is a (closed) subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}(T_\ell(J), e_\ell)$, its reduction modulo ℓ actually *coincides* with $\mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell)$. It follows from Lemma 6.5 that

$$G_\ell = \mathrm{Sp}(T_\ell(J), e_\ell).$$

In particular, the reduction of G_ℓ modulo ℓ^i coincides with $\mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell^i], \bar{e}_{\ell^i})$ for all positive integers i. Since G_{ℓ,J,K_0} contains G_ℓ, its reduction modulo ℓ^i contains $\mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell^i], \bar{e}_{\ell^i})$. This means that $\tilde{G}_{\ell^i,J,K_0}$ contains $\mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell^i], \bar{e}_{\ell^i})$ for all positive i. This proves Lemma 6.7 for all n that are powers of an odd prime ℓ.

Now let us consider the general case. So, $n > 1$ is an odd integer. Let S be the (finite nonempty) set of prime divisors ℓ of n and $n = \prod_{\ell \in S} \ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell)}$ where all $\mathbf{d}(\ell)$ are positive integers. Using Remark 6.4, we may replace if necessary K_0 by $K_{0,n}$ and assume that

$$\tilde{G}_{\ell,J,K_0} = \mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell], \bar{e}_\ell)$$

for all $\ell \in S$. The already proven case of prime powers tells us that

$$\tilde{G}_{\ell^{d(\ell)},J,K_0} = \mathrm{Sp}\left(J\left[\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell)}\right], \bar{e}_\ell\right)$$

for all $\ell \in S$. On the other hand, we have

$$\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} = \oplus_{\ell \in S} \mathbb{Z}/\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell)}\mathbb{Z}, \ J[n] = \oplus_{\ell \in S} J\left[\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell)}\right],$$

$$\mathrm{Gp}(J[n],\bar{e}_n)=\prod_{\ell\in S}\mathrm{Gp}\left(J\left[\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell)}\right],\bar{e}_{\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell)}}\right),\ \mathrm{Sp}(J[n],\bar{e}_n)=\prod_{\ell\in S}\mathrm{Sp}\left(J\left[\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell}\right],\bar{e}_{\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell)}}\right),$$
$$\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}\subset\prod_{\ell\in S}\tilde{G}_{\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell)},J,K_0}=\prod_{\ell\in S}\mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell}],\bar{e}_{\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell)}}).$$

Recall that the group homomorphisms

$$\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}\to\tilde{G}_{\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell)},J,K_0}=\mathrm{Sp}\left(J\left[\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell}\right],\bar{e}_{\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell)}}\right)$$

(induced by the inclusion of the Galois modules $J\left[\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell)}\right]\subset J[n]$) are *surjective*. We want to use *Goursat's Lemma* and *Ribet's Lemma* [19, Sect. 1.4], in order to prove that the subgroup

$$\tilde{G}_{n,J,K_0}\subset\prod_{\ell\in S}\mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell}],\bar{e}_{\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell)}})$$

coincides with the whole product. In order to do that, we need to check that simple finite groups that are quotients of $\mathrm{Sp}(J[\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell}]$'s are *mutually nonisomorphic* for *different* ℓ. Recall that

$$\mathrm{Sp}\left(J\left[\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell}\right],\bar{e}_{\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell)}})\right)\cong\mathrm{Sp}_{2g}\left(\mathbb{Z}/\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell)}\mathbb{Z}\right)$$

and therefore is *perfect*. Therefore, all its simple quotients are also perfect, i.e., are finite simple nonabelian groups. Clearly, the only simple nonabelian quotient of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2g}\left(\mathbb{Z}/\ell^{\mathbf{d}(\ell)}\mathbb{Z}\right)$ is

$$\Sigma_\ell:=\mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})/\{\pm1\}.$$

However, the groups Σ_ℓ are perfect and mutually nonisomorphic for distinct ℓ [1, 2]. This ends the proof. □

Remark 6.9. Remark 6.4, Lemmas 6.1 and 6.7, and their proofs remain true if one replaces the jacobian J by any principally polarized g-dimensional abelian variety A over K_0 with $g\geq 2$.

References

[1] E. Artin, *The orders of the linear groups*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **8** (1955), 355–365.

[2] E. Artin, *The orders of the classical simple groups*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **8** (1955), 455–472.

[3] B.M. Bekker, Yu.G. Zarhin, *The divisibility by 2 of rational points on elliptic curves*. Max-Planck-Institut f́ur Mathematik Preprint Series 2016-32, Bonn.

[4] F.A. Bogomolov, *Points of finite order on an Abelian variety*. Math. USSR-Izv., **17:1** (1981), 55–72.

[5] J.W.C. Cassels, *Diophantine equations with special reference to elliptic curves*. J. London Math. Soc. **41** (1966), 193–291.

[6] L. Dieulefait, *Explicit determination of the images of the Galois representations attached to abelian surfaces with* $\mathrm{End}(A)=\mathbb{Z}$. Experimental Math. **11:4** (2002/03), 503–512.

[7] N. Bruin, E.V. Flynn, *Towers of 2-covers of hyperelliptic curves*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **357** (2005), no. 11, 4329–4347.

[8] C. Khare and J.-P. Wintenberger, *Serre's modularity conjecture*. I, II. Invent Math. **178** (2009), 485–586.

[9] D. Mumford, Tata Lectures on Theta. II. Progress in Math. **43**, Birkhäuser, Boston Basel Stutgart, 1984.

[10] B. Poonen, *Computing torsion points on curves*. Experimental Math. **10** (2001), no. 3, 449–465.

[11] B. Poonen, M. Stoll, *Most odd degree hyperelliptic curves have only one rational point*. Annals of Math. **180** (2014), Issue 3, 1137–1166.

[12] M. Raynaud, *Courbes sur une variété abélienne et points de torsion*. Invent. Math. **71** (1983), no. 1, 207–233.

[13] M. Raynaud, *Sous-variétés sur une variété abélienne et points de torsion*. In: Arithmetic and Geometry (Shafarevich Festschrift) I, pp. 327–352. Progress in Math. **35** (1983), Birkh$^{\prime}$auser, Boston Basel Stutgart.
[14] E. Schaefer, 2-*descent on the Jacobians of hyperelliptic curves*. J. Number Theory **51** (1995), no. 2, 219–232.
[15] J.-P. Serre, Abelian ℓ-adic representations and elliptic curves, 2nd edition. Advanced Book Classics, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Advanced Book Program, Redwood City, CA, 1989.
[16] J.-P. Serre, Algebraic groups and class fields. Graduate Texts in Math. **117**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.
[17] J.-P. Serre, *Lettre á Marie-France Vignéras*. Collected papers. **IV:137**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000, pp. 38–55.
[18] J.-P. Serre, *Sur le representations modulaires de degre 2 de* $\mathrm{Gal}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Q})$. Duke Math. J. **54** (1987), 179–230.
[19] J.-P. Serre, Finite Groups: An Introduction. International Press, Boston, 2016.
[20] A. Vasiu, *Surjectivity criteria for p-adic representations*. I. Manuscripta Math. **112** (2003), no. 3, 325–355.
[21] L.C. Washington, Elliptic Curves: Number Theory and Cryptography. Second edition. Chapman & Hall/CRC Press, Boca Raton London New York, 2008.
[22] J. Yelton, *Images of* 2*-adic representations associated to hyperelliptic jacobians*. J. Number Theory **151** (2015), 7–17.
[23] Yu. G. Zarhin, *Hyperelliptic jacobians without complex multiplication*. Math. Research Letters **7** (2000), 123–132.
[24] Yu. G. Zarhin, *Division by 2 on elliptic curves*. arXiv:1507.08238 [math.AG].

Pennsylvania State University, Department of Mathematics, University Park, PA 16802, USA
E-mail address: zarhin@math.psu.edu